

## Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15 and 17-22 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-22 are pending.

### OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The abstract was objected to for having an incomplete sentence. A replacement abstract is submitted herewith in Appendix A. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-22 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,608,615 issued to Martins (*Martins*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,119 issued to Edwards (*Edwards*) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0122839 of Matraszek, et al. (*Matraszek*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-22 are not rendered obvious by *Martins*, *Edwards* and *Matraszek*.

Claim 1 recites:

receiving, from an eye interpretation engine, at least an interpretation of eyetracking data corresponding to at least one user;  
receiving external context data corresponding to at least one user's interaction with an application, wherein the external context data is related to an operational state associated with a computing device running the application; and  
dynamically acting on a characteristic of the application based, at least in part, on the interpretation of the eyetracking data and the external context data.

Thus, Applicants claim use of external context data and eyetracking data to dynamically act on an application, where the external context data is related to an operational state associated with a computing device running the application. Claims 4, 7, 9, 12 and 15 similarly recite various embodiments of use of external context data and eyetracking data to dynamically act on an application, where the external context data is related to an operational state associated with a computing device running the application.

*Martins* is cited to teach tracking a user's eye gaze while the user is browsing a web page. See Office Action at page 3. *Martins* discloses modifying the appearance of a web page based on historical gaze data. See, for example, col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 12; col. 4, lines 45-63. Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Martins* does not disclose receiving eyetracking data from an eye interpretation engine. Applicants submit that *Martins* further fails to disclose use of external context data to dynamically act on an application.

*Edwards* is cited to teach an eye interpretation engine. See Office Action at page 4. However, *Edwards* fails to disclose use of external context data to dynamically act on an application. *Matraszek* is cited to teach use of external data. However, the external data disclosed by *Matraszek* is biometric data and not related to an operational state associated with a computing device running the application. Because none of *Martins*, *Edwards* and *Matraszek* disclose use of external context data to dynamically act on an application, no combination of *Martins*, *Edwards* and *Matraszek* can teach or suggest claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 12 and 15.

Claims 2, 3 and 17 depend from claim 1. Claims 5, 6 and 18 depend from claim 4. Claims 8 and 19 depend from claim 7. Claims 10, 11 and 20 depend from claim 9.

Claims 13, 14 and 21 depend from claim 12. Claims 16 and 22 depend from claim 15.

Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend,

Applicants submit that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16-22 are not rendered

obvious by *Martins*, *Edwards* and *Matraszek* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: March 19, 2008

/Paul A. Mendonsa/  
Paul A. Mendonsa  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 439-8778

Attachments

**Appendix: Replacement Abstract**